DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 156 FL 012 353

AUTHOR Klinck, Patricia A.
TITLE Evaluation of the Immersion Weekends. French Centre, University of Calgary 1980-81.
PUB DATE Apr 81
NOTE 39p.: For related documents see FL 012 350 and ED 201 178.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Second Language Programs; Communicative Competence (Languages); Cultural Education; *Enrichment Activities; Extracurricular Activities; *Formative Evaluation; *French; Higher Education; *Immersion Programs; Native Speakers; *Weekend Programs
IDENTIFIERS *University of Calgary (Canada)

ABSTRACT

A formative evaluation was made of immersion weekends sponsored by the French center to determine how improvements in the role of monitors can enhance the oral production of students. Two weekends were observed and some in-service training with evaluator and monitors was held between the weekends. Three instruments were used to categorize and systematize the observations: (1) a chart for observing non-verbal action, (2) a chart for evaluating question techniques, and (3) classification of corrections. Observation was done within the following framework: (1) how monitors fostered good rapport with students, (2) the nature of the correcting process, and (3) the level of skill in questioning techniques. A description of both weekends is included as well as an analysis of the data on the monitors. Also included is an outline of the intervention in-service session. Appendices provide the original proposal to the government for the weekends, observation collection charts, a resume of monitors' questionnaires, and the intervention in-service materials. (AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED206156

EVALUATION OF THE

IMMERSION WEEKENDS

FRENCH CENTRE

UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

1980-81

by

P. Klinck

April 1981

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia A. Klinck

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL 012 353

Table of Contents

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. EVALUATION 1

A. Purpose of the Evaluation 1
B. Evaluation Strategy and Instruments 2
C. Observation and Participation 3

III. ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE TWO WEEKENDS OBSERVED 3

A. Target Group 3
B. Instructional Staff 3
C. Site 4

IV. DESCRIPTION AND ASSESSMENT OF SEPTEMBER 27 5

A. Cultural Theme 5
B. Assessment 5
1) Correction Grid 6
2) Non-Verbal Behaviour 7
C. Types of Questions 9

V. INTERVENTION IN-SERVICE 10

A. Timing and Style of the Presentation 10
B. Content and Method of Presentation 11

VI. OBSERVATION OF THE NOVEMBER 14 WEEKEND 13

A. Corrections 13
B. Non-Verbal Behaviour 13
C. Use of Question Techniques 13

Page

VII. FOLLOW-UP SESSION 14

VIII. REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 1980 RECOMMENDATIONS 15

1) Timing of the Weekends 15

2) Variation of Themes 15

3) Monitor In-Service and Selection of Candidates 15

CONCLUSION 17

APPENDICES 18

I. INTRODUCTION

In September 1979 a joint meeting of Mrs. D. Mydlarski, Director of the French Centre (University of Calgary) and Advanced Education and Manpower (Government of Alberta) decided to evaluate the University's projects funded by Special Projects. An external evaluation was presented in May 1980 of the Drop-In Centre and the Immersion Weekends. This was a summative evaluation.

In consultation with Ms. P. Klinck, external evaluator, Mrs. Mydlarski proposed that an evaluation be undertaken for the 1980-81 scholastic year (September to April). As suggested in the 1980 Report, this evaluation was to be formative, focusing on the crucial role of the monitor. It was based on the following plan:

a) An initial observation of a weekend.

b) An intervention in-service.

c) A second weekend evaluation.

d) De-briefing session. (Appendix A)

Although the recommendations of the 1980 Report were not extensive, the evaluator deemed it worthy that their implementation should be verified and any effect on the weekends observed.

II. EVALUATION

A. Purpose of the Evaluation

The purposes of this evaluation are:

1. To provide an analysis of the monitor's role during the first weekend.

2. To describe the intervention in-service given to

monitors on their role.

3. To observe and analyse the effects of the in-service on the monitors' ability to handle their role in a subsequent weekend.

4. To determine to what extent the 1980 recommendations have been implemented and what effect they have had on immersion weekends.

5. To provide the French Centre with further recommendations for the Immersion Weekend program.

As in the 1980 Report, the thrust of this evaluation will be description, analysis and assessment of outcomes. The outcomes are not changes in student linguistic behaviour. Rather the outcomes are: heightened appreciation of the French language and the complex nature of communication. We have already determined that the format of activities follows the best of second language teaching principles and that the climate of the weekends is conducive to spontaneous use of French. What is to be determined is how improvements in the monitors' role can in fact enhance the oral production of students.

B. Evaluation Strategy and Instruments

The following instruments were developed to categorize and systematize observations and to give the assurance of the objectives and consistency of data. They deal exclusively with the role of the monitor.

1. Chart for observing non-verbal action.

2. Chart for evaluating question techniques.

3. Classification of Corrections. (Appendix B)

C. Observation and Participation

To ensure that the climate of spontaneity and enjoyment was not marred by the presence of an "evaluator-inspector", the evaluator took part in the weekends. She was also involved in giving in-service - this allowed for and encouraged a feeling of collegiality with the monitors. Furthermore, students remembered the evaluator from last year. They were open and at ease with the evaluator.

Observation was done within the following framework: how did the monitors foster a good rapport with students, what was the nature of the correcting process, what was the level of skill in questioning techniques.

The observation schedule was as follows:

Sept. 27-28 - Sat. from 8:30 - 3:30. Initially the evaluator was to observe the second weekend (Oct. 14-15). This was unfortunately impossible.

Nov. 15-16 - Sat. 2:30 p.m. to Sunday 2:30 p.m.

III. ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE TWO WEEKENDS OBSERVED

A. Target Group

In the first weekend 16 participants were involved. In the second weekend, the enrollment had increased to 30.

B. Instructional Staff

There was a small group of monitors - six in all, chosen from an initial group of nine. Competition was very stiff. A core of four

Québecoises were chosen. They were present at most weekends. Although all four were women, and the Centre would have preferred a better balance, no problems seemed to arise. Two male monitors were available for substitution or when numbers demanded.

Although the nature of the monitor's role did not change, the leadership did. Rather than no leader or an appointed one, the Centre rotated the leadership among the four main monitors. This proved to be highly effective. (See Appendix C)

All monitors took the pre-session in-services (see Appendix A) and the intervention in-service. The in-service program was part of the recommendations from the last evaluation.

C. Site

As concern was expressed last year about the quality of the food and the lack of typical French food, consideration was given to changing sites. The first weekend was held in Yamnuska Centre as last year.

The second, and all subsequent weekends, were held at Silver Creek Ranch. Silver Creek Ranch is located approximately 92 kilometres from Calgary. It is in the foothills near a small town. It is an excellent area for horse back riding, hiking and skiing. There is a two-storey log building which serves as a dining centre and large meeting area. It has a large wood-burning fireplace. Nearby are several log buildings which each have dormitories and a large area which allow for full group activities. Near the central area are trails leading to several other log cabins which may be used as alternatives

for group activities.

The personnel, the Roessingh family, all possess some command of French. Equally important is the fact that they will adapt their menus to serve French food: croissants, ratatouille, quiche, etc.

Assessment: In the evaluator's opinion the change of sites was an excellent idea. The Roessingh family is hospitable. There was always tea or coffee and cookies available. They made a consistent effort to speak French to participants.

The main building is conducive to sitting near the fire and chatting. Although the dormitory buildings are basically less inviting, the monitors worked hard at decorating them with posters and signs in French. One had the impression of being in a French-speaking area!

IV. DESCRIPTION AND ASSESSMENT OF SEPTEMBER 27

A. Cultural Theme

In keeping with last year's recommendation, the theme of this weekend was new: le 75ième Anniversaire de l'Alberta. Monitors had shown initiative, creativity and hard work in setting up the various activities.

B. Assessment

The purpose of the evaluation this weekend was specific. Observations were noted based on the following: correction grid, types of questions, non-verbal behaviour.

1) Correction Grid

One of the goals of the weekend is spontaneous and natural use of French; the question of correction is a philosophical one. One may ask if correction is necessary, how and when correction should be done, what effect correction has on the student.

In the evaluator's opinion the method of correction is a vital one in the establishing of a good climate. Too much correction, too soon establishes a fear of failure. Furthermore, it inhibits spontaneity even among the most confident. It is self-evident, however, that some errors destroy meaningful communcations.

Types of Corrections	Ways of Correcting	When Does Correction Start?
- pronunciation	- paraphrasing	- at the very first?
- syntax	- "zeroing in"	- during meals?
- tenses	- repetition	- at pre-arranged times?
- vocabulary		

Is it used when critical? Has meaning been lost?

Is correction done in large groups? One-on-one?

Assessment

In general monitors did not tend to over-correct. They were fairly consistent in correcting the most severe errors of grammar and vocabulary. Errors in pronunciations and intonation were wisely ignored unless they inhibited understanding.

Only two techniques were used for correction: direct correction (grammar) and definition and example (vocabulary). Correction was done

in large group as well as small group situations.

It is interesting to note that one of the first games, "Jeu de l'étiquette" dealt with the difference between masculine and feminine adjectives. This was an excellent choice. Students tended to do well. The obvious danger is the temptation to correct the errors - which in fact are relatively insignificant.

The monitors resisted this temptation. It was gratifying to note that several students were capable of self-monitoring.

2) Non-Verbal Behaviour

The instrument used for collecting observations allowed the evaluator to look at a variety of factors which enhance rapport.

For each category there were key words or questions to direct the evaluator. This ensured a degree of objectivity.

<u>Use of Gestures</u> - positives - open arms, hands, etc.
- stance
- nodding
- ease of movement
- to explain meaning
- negatives - rigidly in one spot
- folded arms
- aggressive stance

<u>Facial Expressions</u> - smiles, laughs, warmth

<u>Eye Contact</u> - inclusion of all students
- looks at each individual
- looks at individual while talking to him

(cont'd)

Voice Tone - clarity
- projection
- variations
- pace, speed
- laughter

Movement - figé?
- easy movement among students
- too much movement, agitated

Assessment

a) Eye Contact. The monitors tended to have good eye contact. They used eye contact to include students. They kept an eye on retiring, timid students and encouraged them by addressing comments to them.

The monitors had chosen the circle for a seating arrangement. This form is conducive to discussion. They were alerted to the problem of eye contact with students on either side of them.

b) Voice Quality. In general, monitors showed good voice control and projection. They seemed, however, unaware of pace and variation of volume. There was a lot of laughter and a general feeling of ease.

c) Gestures. This group of monitors was very strong in their use of gestures. They used gestures which showed ease, warmth, expansiveness and a desire to include everyone. They possessed a good use of mime to explain meaning.

d) Facial Expressions. They were a smiling, friendly-appearing group. Although the first weekend is fairly stressful, they always looked at ease and conveyed a sense of enjoyment.

e) Movement among Groups. None of them appeared to be unable to move from one group to another. In so doing they managed to be near different people. This contributed to a cohesive feeling and to a sense of participation.

C. Types of Questions

The instrument used to collect this data is based on "Questioning Skills".* This division of questions was chosen among many. It has the advantage of being simple and straightforward. As the monitors are not education students and as the in-service time was limited, practicality was of prime importance. The categories used allow students to concentrate on a few forms.

a) The category of fluency was established because to speak fluently one must ask many questions. The great majority of questions fall into the category of factual or descriptive. They call upon memory.

b) Probing questions. These questions demand that a student goes deeper for an answer. He must explain, justify, or hypothesize.

c) High order questions. One must think or reflect. For example, an answer might be based on personal values, a comparison of ideas, or a problem to be solved.

d) Divergent questions. In this category there are no right or wrong questions, only creative, imaginative ones. A student may be

---

*P. Allen, K. Ryan, Robert Bush and J. Cooper, Teaching Skills for Secondary Teachers (General Learning Corporation, 1969).

asked his reactions to a hypothetical question or to brainstorm, etc.

Assessment

The majority of questions asked fell into the fluency category. They relied heavily on memory (e.g., of the slide presentation). Many of the questions could be answered by yes or no.

Literally all the questions were asked by the monitor in the large group sessions. Some of the games required that students question each other in small groups.

Monitors tended to fall back on lecture-style presentations, a form which works well for advanced information processing. However, the goal of an immersion is student oral production!

Monitors were also ill at ease with "long" silences. These silences tended to follow the higher forms of questions. It is, of course, understandable that second language learners take longer with these answers. It is equally understandable that the monitors, faced with a "long" silence, answered their own questions!

In conclusion, this situation was not as conducive to oral exchange and student-directed talk as the monitors would have liked it to be.

V. INTERVENTION IN-SERVICE

A. Timing and Style of the Presentation

It has been decided that the intervention in-service would follow the September 27 observation periods. Due to a situation beyond the control of the evaluator, the in-service was not given until October 27.

The evaluator was most desirous to maintain a high degree of collegiality with the monitors. It was decided therefore to have a supper meeting. The evaluator also decided that the in-service would be conducted in several modes:

1) reaction panel
2) small group discussion
3) hands-on work (questions, exercises)
4) a strict minimum of information-giving.

These methods are also highly desirable as the in-service was directed to adults who, like their students, had experience in learning a second language.

B. Content and Method of Presentation

The following plan gives a summary of the areas of discussion, the goals of each area, the time spent and the activity engaged in by the monitors and the evaluator. The atmosphere was very informal. Questions and reactions were encouraged by monitors and evaluator alike.

Approx. Time	Area of Discussion and Goals of Discussion	Activity: Student	Activity: Evaluator
5:00	Introduction - review of 1980 report - review of evaluator's role	listening	presentation
5:10	Linguistic Autobiography - goal: self-awareness, i.e., an adult learning a second language	exchange based on questions which delved into the monitors' experiences with learning a second language	
5:35	Use of Non-Verbals: - goal: self-awareness, analysis of how to create an atmosphere by use of non-verbals	in groups of two, students work through the handout (Appendix D, I) and present by mime and actions	
5:40	Corrections - goals: self-awareness and awareness of student reactions. Control over the instinct to correct	exchange of ideas on the philosophy and practise of corrections	
6:00	The Good Second Language Learner - H.H. Stern	note-taking	presentation of research
6:20	Question Techniques - goal: to present different categories of questions to make students aware of the importance of questions to use the category of question and design: - questions to ask students - real situations in which students must use the category of question	listening writing a critique of questions (Appendix D, 2) and discussing them using a picture to ask as many fluency questions as possible exercise on probing questions exercise to change factual questions to higher order exercise to make divergent questions	listening and comparing
7:00	What inhibits good questions and answers, and how to solve the problem	listening, note-taking	presentation
7:30	How to self-evaluate your weekend immersions	note-taking	presentation on blackboard

VI. OBSERVATION OF THE NOVEMBER 14 WEEKEND

A. Corrections

There were substantially fewer corrections in which the monitor zeroed in on one error. They allowed errors which did not affect meaning to pass.

Where necessary, errors in vocabulary were corrected by using definition, examples, synonyms and antonyms.

Some endeavour was made to re-phrase or paraphrase sentences in which there were errors.

In the evaluator's opinion the reduction of error correction created a more positive environment. Students felt free to ask for correction.

B. Non-Verbal Behaviour

As the first weekend proved, this group of monitors are particularly good communicators. Their use of gestures, smiles and good voice control continued to be above average. Where pacing and speed had been a problem, the monitors concerned made a concerted effort to slow the pace and speed of speech.

C. Use of Question Techniques

In general, there was a marked increase in the use of all forms of questions. Monitors had developed games and group situations which facilitated questioning techniques for students.

Monitors appeared to be more aware of questioning techniques. In various situations a monitor would re-phrase another's question in order to use a higher level question.

Assessment

The greatest increase was in the area of fluency questions. Monitors asked more questions of this type. They also created situations in which students asked questions.

Questions such as "vous avez compris?" were used far less. Monitors should be encouraged to explore "questions de contrôle" which allow them to verify student comprehension.

Probing questions and divergent questions were frequently used.

In the evaluator's opinion the monitors had shown great improvement in question techniques.

There is still a tendency to fall back on lecture-style presentations. It is no doubt seen to be highly efficient. Although this is true, it is more effective to rely on the knowledge and experience of the participants. Monitors should be encouraged to avoid lecturing (for example on topics such as Quebec history or geography) and to explore questioning, panels, etc. to elicit the information.

VII. FOLLOW-UP SESSION

The Director, monitors and evaluator met in the week following to discuss the above observations. The evaluator was impressed by the positive changes and communicated this to the monitors. Discussion touched on the weaknesses referred to above. Suggestions for change were exchanged.

VIII. REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 1980 RECOMMENDATIONS

1) Timing of the Weekends

It was recommended that the dates of weekends be reviewed. No weekends were cancelled this year. Furthermore, the Director showed an awareness of student needs and innovated several changes. There were two one-day immersions as well as two morning immersions for true beginners.

2) Variation of Themes

The evaluator was very aware of the number of students who returned this year for a weekend. The imagination shown by the monitors in their choice of themes certainly was positive for all. They were also very creative in their treatment of themes.

Date	Theme
September 27-28	le 75ième Anniversaire de l'Alberta
October 18-19	Halloween
November 15-16	La Joie de Vivre au Québec
February 7-8	Le Carnaval du Québec

The increase in numbers is ample evidence of the popularity and success of the weekends.

3) Monitor In-Service and Selection of Candidates

A. Background

As monitors are not trained second language teachers, indeed are often not involved in teaching programs, they need in-service.

It is particularly important that this occur before any immersion activities so that they are sensitized to some of the difficulties of the participants. They must also be made aware of their role during the weekend and the expectations of the administration.

Monitors attended the in-service. Activities were planned so that prospective monitors could be observed interacting with others. On this basis a group of six were chosen. They were placed in a probationary period. All monitors were engaged to serve in the Drop-In Centre as well. (Some monitors work in the Drop-In Centre only.)

Assessment

From the questionnaire (Appendix C) it is apparent that the pre-session in-service was valuable. In the evaluator's opinion it is a *sina qua non* for immersion weekends whether they are managed by monitors or by teaching personnel. The period of orientation (in-service) accomplishes several goals:

a) creates awareness of the adult learner's strengths and weaknesses
b) recalls techniques for facilitating conversation
c) stresses the importance of good L_2 teaching in the planning of the program
d) fosters a feeling of cooperation and team work in the monitors

This particular in-service served several other goals - a sort of hidden agenda! It allowed for a screening of prospective monitors, it emphasized the expectations of the monitor by the administration, it gave the role

of the monitor a certain profile: monitors were not guaranteed employment simply because they were francophone. A job description and expectations were clear to all from the outset.

This awareness coupled with the diligence of the administration in overseeing the weekends and in giving clearly defined authority to the "leader" put the program on a much firmer basis from the outset.

CONCLUSION

The French Centre is to be commended for the strength and vigor it has given to its program and to its monitors.

In particular the evaluator would like to encourage them

1) to continue the pre-session in-service of monitors
2) to maintain the diversity of immersion situations: weekend, one-day and morning immersions
3) to maintain the format of the weekend while allowing freedom to change activities
4) to continue to rotate the leadership of weekends among participating monitors
5) to pursue actively in-service sessions which concentrate on second language teaching techniques (questioning techniques, ways of correcting, ways of simplifying language, etc.).

It is recommended that

1) consideration be given to starting immersion weekends on Friday evening.

APPENDICES

APPENDICES

I Appendix A - Proposal submitted to Advanced Education & Manpower

II Appendix B - Observation Collection Charts

1) Types of Questions
2) Corrections
3) Non-Verbal Behaviour

III Appendix C - Résumé of Monitors' Questionnaires

IV Appendix D - Intervention In-Service Materials

1) Non-Verbal Behaviour Exercise
2) Quelques Questions à Analyser
3) Probing Questions
4) Questions Abstraites et Questions Provocantes

PROPOSAL TO THE DEPARTMENT OF ADVANCED EDUCATION AND MANPOWER

I. (a) NAME OF INSTITUTION: The University of Calgary

(b) CONTACT PERSON: Donna Mydlarski, 284-6827

(c) PROPOSED LOCATION OF PROJECT: to be specified among Yamnuska Centre, Seebe, Alberta; Silver Creek Ranch, Cremona, Alberta; Lacombe Inter-Faith Centre, Midnapore, Alberta; Edmonton, Alberta, possibly the Faculté St-Jean.

(d) PROJECT TITLE: French Immersion Weekends

(e) AUTHORIZATION: _____

Dr. R. S. Chapman, Dean
Faculty of Continuing Education

II. OBJECTIVE OF THE PROJECT:

To provide an informal learning environment conducive to spontaneous expression in the second language, thereby constituting a valuable service to instructional programs both of a credit and non-credit nature.

III. CONTENT DESCRIPTION:

The student/monitor ratio of five to one will assure optimal participation of all students. All communication during the weekend must be in the target language. A variety of linguistic, social and cultural activities are organized, usually around a theme such as "la cabane à sucre" or some other aspect of the French-Canadian cultural heritage. Songs are used extensively. At least one weekend will be planned for Edmonton to participate in the cultural life of the French-Canadian community there. In addition, mini-immersions of 3 - 5 hours will be organized in the Fall term for beginners only, as this group is reticent about joining in the regular immersions. It is hoped that communicative activities directed at the beginners' particular needs combined with a shorter duration would encourage these students to express themselves in French and would eliminate the discouragement that sometimes results when they are placed with considerably more advanced students.

IV. TARGET POPULATION:

Any student taking a French course at the University of Calgary (credit or non-credit). Limit of 30 students per weekend.

V. FORMAT:

(a) TOTAL NUMBER OF CONTACT HOURS - 26 hours per weekend

(b) PROPOSED STARTING DATE - 3 weekends in the Fall term 1980
1 or 2 weekends in the Winter term 1981
2 or 3 immersion days for beginners in the Fall term 1980

This schedule is subject to change due to student interest and enrollments.

VI. PERSONNEL:

Director: Donna Mydlarski, BEd, MA

Monitors: To be selected from among instructors and French-speaking students on campus. They will be required to attend a training workshop on planning and organizing second-language immersions and an in-service evaluation (see section VII, re the latter).

VII. EVALUATION:

The 1979-80 evaluation examined in depth the organization and content of Immersion Weekends. Since the changes recommended were relatively minor, the 1980-81 evaluation will focus on the crucial role of the monitor and will be essentially formative.

The proposed plan would be implemented by P. Klinck:

a) Observation of first weekend to identify the use of non-verbals, questioning techniques and correction techniques.

b) The following week: an in-service with monitors led by P. Klinck to discuss weaknesses perceived in the areas observed under a).

c) Follow-up observation of second weekend.

d) The following week: evaluation session with monitors led by P. Klinck.

The monitors and the director will use a short written questionnaire to obtain feedback on each weekend and mini-immersion.

Pat Klinck will be responsible for writing the final evaluation report on the overall program of Immersion Weekends and "Beginners Days" to determine the effectiveness of organizational changes and use of personnel.

VIII. BUDGET (see attached sheet)

Types of Questions	Student	Teacher
1. Fluency (a) factual		
(b) descriptive		
2. Probing		
3. Higher Order		
4. Divergent Questions		

When does correction start?	What is corrected?	How is it corrected?

MONITOR	Eye Contact	Voice	Gestures	Facial Expressions	Small Moves

APPENDIX C

Selected Answers to Monitor Questionnaire

1. Before starting as monitor you received an in-service course. What was the most valuable aspect of this in-service?

   "The discussion and exercises relating to communication skills. Also the workshops given by Daniel and Cheryl. Both passed on their enthusiasm about their work."

   "Faire acte de présence était la seule façon d'avoir une chance d'avoir l'emploi."

   What would you change (add, delete, increase)?

   "I felt a little uneasy, as no one was as yet hired and this meant working in a competitive environment. Other monitors expressed the same sentiment."

   "J'attendrais d'avoir engagé pour sûr les moniteurs."

2. How have you felt about the rotation of weekend leaders? Would you like to see it again next year?

   "It is a very, very, very good idea. Non seulement j'aimerais, mais il faudrait que ça fonctionne comme ça aussi l'an prochain."

   "I found the distribution of responsibilities quite professional. During the organization, all monitors contributed ideas but when came the immersions weekend, one person coordinated and had the final authority."

   "L'idée est excellente, ça donne l'occasion à chaque personne de se sentir un peu plus responsable, et dans le fond de nous-même on aime tous être un petit peu chef!!!!! C'est absolument à continuer."

   "Je crois que c'était bien car chacun notre tour, on apprenait à prendre un peu plus de responsabilités."

3. Have you found the presence of evaluator inhibiting? If yes, can you suggest changes?

   "The presence of an evaluator always keeps us on our toes."

"Non. Spécialement Pat Klinck, qui connaît l'art d'observer, soit l'art d'être présente tout en étant effacée."

4. Your second in-service was on non-verbals (gestures, voice, etc.), correcting and questioning techniques. What was the most useful aspect?

"Techniques on questioning was the most useful."

What would you change (add, delete, increase emphasis)?

"Perhaps more practical exercises regarding closed and open ended questioning techniques."

5. Did you find the following session after the 2nd weekend useful?

"The session was directed to improvement of the program therefore I cannot argue with improvement."

"Oui, ça a permis de faire le point en théorie, restait à le faire en pratique."

6. The enrolment in weekend immersion has increased steadily. To what do you attribute this success?

"I have noticed a considerable difference in enthusiasm between last year and this year's monitors."

"Au bouche à oreille des participants entre eux qui ont communiqué leur satisfaction - Pourquoi étaient - ils satisfaits? La personnalité chaleureuse et la 'conscience professionnelle' des monitrices et moniteurs."

"Il y a beaucoup plus de gens qui fréquentent le centre quotidiennement. Donc avec l'ambiance qui règne au centre. C'est facile d'attirer les gens vers les fins de semaine. Et je pense que c'est les moniteurs tous ensemble qui ont su créer cette atmosphère!!!

7. Other comments or suggestions which would assist in ensuring continued success.

"(1) Continuation of the in-service courses.
(2) Offer more mini-immersions throughout the year.
(3) More activities in the French Centre."

"Continuer comme ça et surtout, laisser cette belle liberté aux moniteurs!"

	encourager l'étudiant	établir une ambiance chaleureuse	pour établir une ambiance de participation
les gestes			
l'expression			
le regard			
la voix			
35			36

QUELQUES QUESTIONS A ANALYSER

1. Est-ce que le fait de parler la langue change les impressions d'un pays pour un étranger?

2. Combien de temps avez-vous passé en Allemagne?

3. Comment est-ce qu'on vous a reçu en Europe et désirez-vous y retourner l'été prochain?

4. De toutes les villes que vous avez visitées, laquelle préférez-vous, Paris ou Londres?

5. Racontez -nous votre voyage en Europe.

6. A votre avis quel moyen de transport est le plus agréable pour voyager en Europe?

7. Quelles sont les différences les plus frappantes entre le style de vivre européen et américain?

8. Vous avez préféré l'Italie à l'Espagne, n'est-ce pas?

"PROBING QUESTIONS"

Vous avez la question d'un professeur et la réponse de l'étudiant. Posez une autre question pour clarifier la réponse de l'étudiant.

1. Prof: Pour quoi est-ce que la plupart des Indiens étaient du côté des Français pendant les guerres?

   Etud: Parce que les Indiens aimaient bien les Français.

   Votre question:

2. Prof: En dépit de toute évidence qui indique que le cancer des poumons et les cigarettes sont liés il y a des milliers de gens qui continuent à fumer. Pourquoi?

   Etud: Ils aiment le goût des cigarettes.

   Vous:

3. Prof: Comment est-ce que votre vie changerait si vous n'étiez pas obligé de travailler?

   Etud: Je ne me lèverais plus de bonne heure.

   Vous:

QUESTIONS ABSTRAITES

1. Changez ces questions pour qu'elles obligent une réponse bien réfléchie. Par exemple:
   - Quel savant a découvert la bombe atomique?
   - Pourquoi est-ce que la découverte de la bombe atomique a eu lieu pendant la deuxième guerre mondiale?

1. Comment s'appelle ce tableau?

2. Quelles sont les planètes? Commencez avec celle qui est la plus près du soleil?

3. Quelle sorte de voiture est-ce?

4. Où se trouve Paris?

5. Qui a fondé la ville de Calgary?

LES QUESTIONS PROVOCANTES

Modifiez ces questions pour en faire de plus créatrices.
eg. De quels éléments est composée la surface du monde?

- Si la lune et la terre avaient la même atmosphère est-ce que l'exploration de la lune changerait?

1. Quel est le plus grand animal du monde?

2. Quand est-ce que la radio a été inventée?

3. Quelle langue parle-t-on au Brésil?

4. Pourquoi est-ce que le site de Calgary a contribué à sa croissance démographique?

5. Quelle est la population actuelle du Canada?